

AGA280

Torrance, California  
April 23, 1952

MINUTES OF AN ADJOURNED REGULAR  
MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE

The City Council of the City of Torrance convened in an Adjourned Regular Meeting in the Council Chamber of the City Hall on Wednesday, April 23, 1952, at 8:05 P.M., Mayor Schwab presiding.

Those responding to roll call by City Clerk Bartlett were: Councilmen Benstead, Blount, Spelman and Schwab. Also present were City Manager Stevens and City Attorney Hall.

All persons present participated in the salute to our Flag, led by Councilman Spelman.

This being an adjourned regular meeting, Councilman Blount moved to dispense with the regular order of business. Motion, seconded by Councilman Spelman, carried.

As the Mayor announced the time had arrived for the opening of bids, Councilman Drale arrived. Clerk Bartlett opened and read the following bids for 6" pipe for the Water Department:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Price Per Foot</u>
American Cast Iron Pipe Company	\$ 1.57
James B. Clow & Sons	1.60
United States Pipe & Foundry Company	1.543

City Manager Stevens recommended the contract be awarded the low bidder. Councilman Drale moved the contract be awarded to United States Pipe & Foundry Company, as low bidder, and that all other bids be rejected. Motion, seconded by Councilman Blount, carried unanimously by roll call vote.

The City Clerk opened bids for the construction of a playground area at the Walteria Park, as follows:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
Griffith Company	\$ 6,050.00
Guardian Fence Co.	4,257.00
Alcorn Fence Company	5,475.00
N & K Paving Co.	5,600.00
Warren Southwest, Inc.	4,400.00

City Manager Stevens recommended the contract be awarded the low bidder. Councilman Spelman moved the contract be awarded to the Guardian Fence Co., as low bidder, and that all other bids be rejected. Motion, seconded by Councilman Drale, carried unanimously by roll call vote.

The Mayor announced the time had arrived to continue the protest hearing on Seaside Heights Sewer District Assessments and Clerk Bartlett read a letter from Barnett, Hopen and Smith, Assessment Engineers, replying to the protests received at the meeting of April 9th, and recommending that all protests be denied and the assessments confirmed.

Mr. L. J. Marchel, of 5267 Zakon Road, stated he had received no notices of previous hearings, had received nothing in writing to advise the people of the cost, had never seen the contract -- that he had attended a meeting about a year and a half ago, when the sewer was first being discussed, and that the price per front foot at that time was estimated at \$2.75 and that his assessment bill amounts to approximately \$8 per front foot. Mr. Marchel stated he would like to see the original contract. This was procured for him from the vault. He asked why the difference between the \$65,000 estimated cost and the \$82,555.27 actual cost, stating the original estimate would have cost the property owners approximately \$3.80 per front foot and they are now billed for over \$8.00.

Mr. Patrick stated the petition signed indicated an estimated cost per front foot of \$5.89; the estimate was made by looking at the map, not knowing the exact slope of the land; that when they got into it, they had to run a 10" line along Pacific Coast Highway; that the County Sanitation District had requested a 12" line and that he had talked them down to a 10"; that some of the pipe is above the ground and had to be encased; that the estimate was based on an 8" pipe; that the contract was bid on approximate quantities only and supplemented this statement by giving in figures the number of feet of various pipe lengths estimated in the bid and the actual number used on the job; that there were certain modifications required.

Mr. J. W. McClune, of 5320 Doris Way, asked why the matter hadn't been gone into a little more thoroughly before letting the bid rather than make so many changes afterward.

Mr. Patrick replied that bids were on approximate quantities; that it is impossible to accurately determine your needs until you get into the field.

Mr. R. W. Falkner, of 5251 Zakon Road, asked if the County had approved the plans before the job was started and was told "yes".

Mr. James A. Taylor, of 5259 Doris Way, asked if the T's and Y's listed as additional materials needed were because the contractor hadn't put them in, and if so how could that be added to the price; he also asked "Where does the modification start and stop?"

Mr. Patrick replied that the additional Y's were necessary as the plans show they must be placed in accordance with the plumbing in the houses, and that the estimate covered the additional Y's. He stated the modification included the encasing of pipe and the 10" extra strength pipe which had to be used for approximately 460'.

Councilman Drale stated that when there is an increase of such tremendous costs, the original bid should have been thrown out and new bids called for; that the increase was almost 331/3% over the original figure.

Mr. Barnett, of Barnett, Hopen and Smith, Assessment Engineers, suggested the hearing be continued to another meeting so that they would have time to prepare a complete explanation and report, stating the matter was getting too involved.

Councilman Drale stated he still had some questions he would like to ask, and the other members of the Council concurred.

In answer to inquiry, it was reported that \$7,100 of the increase was for incidentals and Councilman Blount asked why the incidentals were not included in the estimate, stating when the Coun-

cil let the contract at \$65,000 they thought that was it; that it was never pointed out to him nor had he ever previously heard of an additional amount above the contract price. Mr. Barnett explained that the engineering expenses and all other incidental expenses and inspection charges are paid by the City in addition to the amount to the contractor. Councilman Blount stated there was still an increase of more than \$10,000 and asked if we did that all the time. Mr. Barnett replied that he could not answer that question off-hand and would like to submit an exact figure of what each item was.

Councilman Drale said it appeared to him that a lot of people were getting sewer for nothing and asked if, at some future date when the present undeveloped property was developed and tied into the sewer those persons would be assessed and if these people now paying for the sewer would get something back. Mr. Barnett replied that the adjoining property would undoubtedly be assessed comparable to what is assessed the property on this job and that there would be nothing coming back to these people.

In answer to a question about a hypothetical case, asked by Councilman Blount, Mr. Barnett explained that each district benefits from the other; that this particular district benefits from the Walteria District in that the Walteria District paid for a lot of trunk lines from which this District now benefits.

AC1230 Councilman Blount asked if the size of the line had been increased because of the fact that someday there would be other people joining it, or was the line figured on exactly the load this district would require. Mr. Patrick replied that the increase to 10" was to provide the velocity needed for the sewer to keep itself clean. Mr. Stevens advised nothing less than an 8" line was ever used, so this line wasn't built up to take care of anyone else.

Councilman Drale stated he was wondering about the adjoining property -- if a subdivision goes in "there won't be any assessment on the property ..... these people will benefit tremendously at the expense of the Seaside Heights subdivision". Mr. Barnett replied that only a small portion of the land to the east could be connected to this line; some will have to go somewhere else because the topography will not permit a connection to this line; some would be connected to the district to the north; and some, right now he didn't see how they were going to be served. Mr. Stevens advised that along a flat surface in order that the sewage will flow, it is necessary to enlarge the size of the pipe; it is required for velocity and not for volume; and that that was the County's reason for requesting a 12" line. He stated, further, that most of the land to the east flows away from this tract.

Mr. McClune stated there was quite a lot of acreage on the south side of 101 Highway that could be tied into the Seaside Heights line and Mr. Patrick replied that it would be possible to connect there.

Mr. Charles Austin asked if the land along the highway was assessed the same as the property in Seaside Heights. Mr. Barnett replied that the same rate was used, and explained the method used to obtain the rate used.

Councilman Spelman asked how many people were involved in making the original survey and estimate and Mr. Patrick replied the party that did the survey and himself.

Mr. James Hunter stated that in the back of his home "there is a tentative tract to go there which runs parallel with the trunk line and will capacitate 54 lots ..... Should this affect our cost? I talked to the surveyors and saw their papers. That was made by Ben Haggott about a year ago." Mr. Patrick replied that this was the property talked about in regard to the 10' easement; that to obtain the easement the City had agreed there would be no assessment; that an easement through this parcel of land was the only feasible way to get into the area. Mr. Hunter asked if he could be included to help pay for the line and was advised that no one can be included on the assessment unless shown on the original assessment diagram; that in this instance, a condition to the granting of the easement was that there would be no assessment.

Mr. McClune asked why the easement was necessary; why the line wasn't brought up the State highway from Walteria and Mr. Patrick explained that cuts to a depth of approximately 35' would have been necessary and that obtaining the easement was the cheaper method of installation.

In reply to inquiry, Mr. Patrick stated that in planning the line, the possibility of another subdivision had not been considered in determining the need for the 10" line; that at that time they were concerned only with velocity.

Mr. Barnett suggested that possibly the City could pass an ordinance to prevent the proposed tract of 54 homes from connecting to this particular line and Councilman Blount stated that he believed the City had relieved itself of that right in accepting the easement on the conditions stipulated.

In response to inquiry, Mr. Barnett stated the sum of all the assessments had to add up to the total cost of the job and the assessments as made. Mr. Williams, of Barnett, Hopen and Smith, explained in more detail the method of assessment and how the final rate was obtained.

Mayor Schwab stated: "I have a feeling we are getting no where fast and it strikes me the only way we are going to get any where is for these engineers to bring something concrete." Mr. Barnett repeated his previous suggestion to continue the meeting to allow time for the compiling of a detailed report. Councilman Blount moved that copies of the report be mailed to the protestants present. Motion was seconded by Councilman Benstead. Councilman Spelman suggested the report include the past history of similar sewer installations in the City for a period of five years. A gentlemen from the audience stated that while there were only 20 present this evening, all 167 were vitally interested and all protested the assessment, and asked that each party receive a copy of the report.

Councilman Blount moved the hearing on the Seaside Heights Sewer District assessments be continued until May 14, 1952, at 8:00 P.M. Motion, seconded by Councilman Spelman, carried.

#### WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Letter from Recreation Director Carpenter replying to protests made on the use of the ballpark for National League Softball and urging the Council to approve use of the Park by the League. His letter stated that such use by the League, one night a week, would not interfere with the local program.

Lengthy discussion was had between members of the Council as to the manner in which this matter had been handled. All were of the opinion that the Commission had been "by-passed" and there had been ample time for the request for such use to have "gone through channels". Councilman Benstead stated he understood this had all been arranged without the Commission being notified; Mayor Schwab and City Manager Stevens stated that was contrary to information they had received. Councilman Benstead replied that he understood "many of these things are done the same way." Councilman Blount, agreeing with Councilman Benstead, stated there have been too many complaints from citizens and that where "there is that much smoke there must be some fire; you don't form a league with that many teams over night; you don't get six or seven companies to pay for uniforms and buy equipment over night." Councilman Blount asked if the Commission had been polled on this matter and City Manager Stevens replied that he did not know; that he had asked the same question and Mr. Carpenter had replied that several of the commission members were active in the league's organization. Councilman Blount moved the Council approve of the action taken by the Recreation Department if the Recreation Commission is polled and also approves. Motion, seconded by Councilman Drale, carried. The statement was made that, in the future, it was hoped such matters would be handled through the Commission and it was suggested that, if necessary, Mr. Carpenter could be invited to an agenda meeting and so informed.

There being no further business, at 9:50 P.M., Councilman Spelman moved the meeting be adjourned. Motion, seconded by Councilman Blount, carried.

  
CITY CLERK OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE

APPROVED:

  
MAYOR OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE

AGA280